

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/817,895	ONODERA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hai C. Pham	2861	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Hai C. Pham. (3) _____
 (2) Paul Fournier, Attorney. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 30 August 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 24,25,27 and 30.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kobayashi (U.S. 6,088,323) & Koyama (U.S. 6,556,234).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Hai C. Pham
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Representative indicates that most of the claims would be cancelled, that the objected claims 24 and 25 would be rewritten in independent form. Applicant's Representative further points out one of the critical features recited in claim 27 where the writing component enlarges a spot size of the light when recording a visible image while the applied art in Kobayashi teaches creating a larger pit size when recording a visible image. The examiner indicates that a thorough analysis of Kobayashi would be conducted again with respect to the teaching of the larger spot size if any once the response to the previous Office action is received. The examiner also indicates that claim 30 is allowed.



HAI PHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER